UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,277	10/31/2003	Bryn Hird	8473MR2	2057
27752 7590 08/08/2008 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY Global Legal Department - IP			EXAMINER	
			WEDDINGTON, KEVIN E	
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor 299 East Sixth Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CINCINNATI, OH 45202			1614	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/699,277	HIRD ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Kevin E. Weddington	1614		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tird d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from te, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>09 I</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This action is FINAL . Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under	is action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8,9,23 and 25-27 is/are pen 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5,6,8,9,23 and 25-27 is/are rejection claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	ier.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the defended or b) for objected to by the defended or by the drawing(s) is objection is required if the drawing(s) is objection is	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D: 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 1614

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 23, 25, 26 and 27 are presented for examination.

Applicants' request for continued examination, amendment, and response filed May 9, 2008 have been received and entered.

Accordingly, the rejection made under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by DesMarais et al. (5,260,345) as set forth in the previous Office action dated January 14, 2008 at pages 2-3 is hereby withdrawn because the DesMarais et al. reference did not teach or suggest the composition is suitable for oral administration.

Accordingly, the rejection made under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Park et al. (5,750,585) in view of Niazi (6,251,241) as set forth in the previous Office action dated January 14, 2008 at pages 3-4 is hereby withdrawn because the Park et al. reference did not teach or suggest the polymeric foam is high internal phase emulsion foam (HIPE) and the composition is suitable for oral administration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 23, 25, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

This is a written description rejection.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,277

Page 3

Art Unit: 1614

A lack of adequate written description issue arises if the knowledge and level of skill in the art would not permit one skilled in the art to immediately envisage the product claimed from the disclosed process. See, e.g., Fujikawa v. Wattanasin, 93 F.3d 1559, 1571, 39 USPQ2d 1895, 1905 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (a "laundry list" disclosure of every possible moiety does not constitute a written description of every species in a genus because it would not "reasonably lead" those skilled in the art to any particular species); In re Ruschig, 379 F.2d 990, 995, 154 USPQ 118, 123 (CCPA 1967).

An applicant may also show that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics which provide evidence that applicant was in possession of the claimed invention, i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.

In particular, the specification as original filed fails to provide sufficient written bases of any of the agents demonstrating wherein possession of use of the broad terms: a polymeric material, a lipase inhibitor, lipase inhibitors and combination thereof, a non-digestible, non-absorbable, open-celled polymeric foam. The mere fact that Applicant may have discovered one type of polymeric material may be used to formulate the non-digestible, non-absorbable, open-celled polymeric foam is not sufficient to claim the entire genus. Also the addition of one type of lipase inhibitor with the instant composition is not sufficient to claim the entire genus. The mere fact the

Art Unit: 1614

Applicant may have discovered a kit with one type of non-digestible, non-absorbable, open-celled polymeric foam is not sufficient to claim the entire genus (claim 27).

The written description requirement for a claimed genus may be satisfied through sufficient description of a representative number of species by actual reduction to practice, reduction to drawings, or by disclosure of relevant, identifying characteristics, i.e., structure or other physical and/or chemical properties, by functional characteristics coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or by a combination of such identifying characteristics, sufficient to show the applicant was in possession of the claimed genus. See Eli Lilly, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406.

A "representative number of species" means that the species which are adequately described are representative of the entire genus. Thus, when there is substantial variation within the genus, one must describe a sufficient variety of species to reflect the variation within the genus. The disclosure of only one species encompassed within a genus adequately describes a claim directed to that genus only if the disclosure "indicates that the patentee has invented species sufficient to constitute the gen[us]."

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 23, 25, 26 and 27 are not allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin E. Weddington whose telephone number is (571)272-0587. The examiner can normally be reached on 12:30 pm-9:00 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,277 Page 5

Art Unit: 1614

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel can be reached on (571)272-0718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kevin E. Weddington Primary Examiner Art Unit 1614

/Kevin E. Weddington/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1614